



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/508,975	09/24/2004	Renee-van Schijndel	118989-04325620	1110

43569 7590 06/27/2005

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
1909 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/508,975

Applicant(s)

SCHIJNDEL ET AL.

Examiner

Rabon Sergeant

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/24/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Within claims 1 and 11, the language, "obtainable by", renders the claims indefinite, as it cannot be determined when the polyurethane is "able" to be obtained from the claimed reaction and when it is not.

Within claims 3 and 7, the language denoted by "preferably" renders the claims indefinite, because it is unclear to what extent the preferred language is to modify the nonpreferred language.

Within line 4 of claim 3, it is unclear how the percent sign is to be interpreted, in view of the claimed ratio language. Furthermore, given the language set forth for the ratio, it is questioned if the claim requires the selection of the dimer fatty acid of claim 1; if not, then clarification is required.

With respect to claim 5, it is unclear if the claim language is to allow for the polyester to be additionally derived from the dianhydrohexitol.

Within claims 6 and 7, bases have not been clearly set forth for the claimed weight percents.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1711

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krebs ('493) in view of Meyborg et al. ('051) and Dirlikov et al. ('563).


Krebs et al. disclose hotmelt polyurethane adhesives produced from the reaction of polyisocyanate, polyester polyols, and chain extender, wherein suitable reactants for the polyester polyol are disclosed as being dimer fatty acids and dimer fatty alcohols. See abstract; column 4, lines 23-52; and column 5, lines 41-47.

4. Though Krebs et al. fail to disclose the use of 1,4:3,6 dianhydrohexitol in the production of the polyurethanes, the position is taken that the use of these compounds as extenders within polyurethane compositions was known at the time of invention. This position is supported by the teachings of Meyborg et al. and Dirlikov et al. Meyborg et al. disclose at column 1, lines 40+ that the use of 1,4:3,6 dianhydrohexitol as a chain extender within polyurethanes permits the production of high quality polymers from compositions having adjustable potlife. Dirlikov et al. disclose at column 5, lines 53+ that the use of dianhydrohexitol within polyurethanes is believed to improve hydrolytic stability and thermostability. Therefore, in view of the expectation that improved properties would result, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

Art Unit: 1711

incorporate 1,4:3,6 dianhydrohexitol as a reactant within the adhesive compositions of the primary reference.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

R. Sergent
June 23, 2005